



Understanding creaminess

Frøst, Michael Bom; Janhøj, Thomas

Published in:
International Dairy Journal

DOI:
[10.1016/j.idairyj.2007.02.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2007.02.007)

Publication date:
2007

Document version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Frøst, M. B., & Janhøj, T. (2007). Understanding creaminess. *International Dairy Journal*, 17(11), 1298-1311.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2007.02.007>

1 Review

2
3 Understanding creaminess

4
5
6 Michael Bom Frøst*, Thomas Janhøj

7
8 *Department of Food Science, Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Rolighedsvej 30, DK-1958*
9 *Frederiksberg, Denmark*

10
11
12 Published in International Dairy Journal 17(11) p.1298-1311

13
14
15 *Corresponding author. Tel.: +45 3528 3207; fax: +45 3528 3509

16 *E-mail address:* mbf@life.ku.dk (M. B. Frøst)

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

Abstract

Our research has concerned creaminess in low fat dairy products of different types, covering the range from liquids (acidified milk drinks), over weak gels (vanilla yoghurts, plain stirred yoghurt) to semi-solids (cream cheese). We have studied both physical background for creaminess and sensory perception of creaminess. The intention has been to understand general aspects of creaminess that applies to the whole range of product categories studied, but also to explore differences between different types of dairy products. The goal has been to collect a coherent mass of knowledge linking different types of measurements with multivariate data analysis. The present paper presents an overview of our findings and discusses them, as well as drawing upon others' work to cover what we have not studied.

Keywords: Creaminess; Low fat dairy products; Sensory analysis; Rheology; Microstructure; Consumer perception; Multivariate data analysis; PLSR

Contents

1.	Introduction
2.	Physical and chemical basis for creaminess
2.1.	Relationships with physical and chemical properties - instrumental prediction of creaminess
3.	Perception of creaminess
3.1.	Correlations with other sensory properties
3.2.	Individual differences in rating of creaminess
3.3.	Integration of input from different sensory modalities
3.4.	Neural correlates of multisensory stimuli
4.	Conclusions
5.	Future directions for creaminess research
	Acknowledgements
	References

53 1. Introduction

54

55 Consumers increasingly demand products that possess positive nutritional qualities (e.g., a
56 low fat or energy content), while simultaneously having appealing sensory properties. New and
57 ‘healthy’ foods need to taste good to achieve success in the market place (Martens, Frøst, &
58 Martens, 2005). Developing and manufacturing these products is a continuing challenge for the
59 dairy industry. As many as 75 to 90% of all new food products launched fail in the market
60 (Buisson, 1995). Many of the first reduced-fat products to enter the market had poor and
61 undesirable sensory properties, and low-fat products in general suffered from a bad image among
62 consumers (Cardello, 1994). Regretfully consumers often perceive fat-reduced dairy products as
63 less palatable than products of the same type, but with a higher fat content (Cardello, 1994; Tuorila,
64 Cardello, & Leshner, 1994). Although many successful low fat dairy products have been launched
65 since the early days of low fat technology, the general impression is that consumer liking of low fat
66 dairy products is still not equal to that of the full fat versions. Thus, technological challenges
67 abound for the dairy industry, especially in mimicking the flavour and texture profiles of full-fat
68 products.

Comment [F1]:

69 ‘Creaminess’ is a highly interesting and much debated topic. It is generally accepted that
70 creaminess has an intrinsic positive hedonic¹ component and is a key driver of sensory appeal. It
71 has been demonstrated repeatedly in dairy products that consumers’ hedonic response is strongly
72 positively correlated to creaminess. This has been shown to be the case for both strawberry yoghurts
73 (Ward, Koeferli, Schwegler, Schaeppi, & Plemmons, 1999) and plain yoghurts (Folkenberg &
74 Martens, 2003). Furthermore it has been found that consumers’ rated perception of creaminess in a
75 broad range of liquid dairy products are strongly positively correlated to the same consumers

¹ hedonic – of or relating to pleasure. In wider use, mainly in psychology: of, pertaining to, or involving pleasurable or painful sensations or feelings, considered as affects, *from Oxford English Dictionary*.

76 overall liking of the products (Richardson-Harman et al., 2000). In another product category
77 containing dairy ingredients, vanilla pudding, the same relationships have been observed (Elmore,
78 Heymann, Johnson, & Hewett, 1999). Thus, naturally there is a high level of interest in
79 understanding human perception of creaminess. Unfortunately, a high level of creaminess is often
80 closely correlated with a high fat level. Technological solutions that reduce the fat content of dairy
81 products, while still maintaining a desirable level of creaminess, are much wanted by the industry.
82 The problems encountered by product development staff have been studied using qualitative
83 methods (Parr, Knox, & Hamilton, 2001). Problems with mouth feel/texture, flavour, changes to
84 production process, shelf life as well as confusion with respect to which ingredients to use, were all
85 mentioned as barriers to the development of low-fat dairy products.

86 Understanding creaminess can be approached from many angles, but requires a
87 multidisciplinary effort to succeed. Over the years scientists have investigated creaminess from
88 many different angles, posing and answering different scientific questions that can be classified as
89 described below, even though it may prove impossible to completely separate the different research
90 questions.

- 91 1. Physical and chemical basis for creaminess
92
93 a. Relationships with physical and chemical properties (instrumentally measured)
94 b. Effects of different ingredients (model systems and foods)
95
- 96 2. Sensory perception of creaminess (for consumers and trained sensory panellists)
97
98 a. Relationships between creaminess and other more simple sensory properties
99 b. Interactions between sensory modalities (vision, olfaction, gustation and touch)
100 c. The concept of creaminess
- 101 3. Human-food interactions
102
103 a. Effect of food breakdown
104 b. Oral processing and perception

105 Over the past few years we have explored creaminess addressing questions of the two first
106 types. In our research we have covered low fat dairy products of different types, covering the range
107 from liquids, over weak gels to semi-solids. The intention has been to understand general aspects of
108 creaminess that apply to the whole range of product categories studied, but also to explore
109 differences between different types of dairy products. The goal has been to collect a coherent mass
110 of knowledge linking different types of measurements with multivariate data analysis. The present
111 paper presents an overview of our findings, as well as drawing upon others' work to cover what
112 we have not studied.

113

114 **2. Physical and chemical basis for creaminess**

115

116 The physical and chemical background for creaminess - before it becomes a sensory
117 perception - is a necessary understanding for both material scientists and dairy product
118 manufacturers to develop successful low fat dairy products.

119 Not surprisingly, creaminess is linked to milk fat globules in dairy products. Fat serves as
120 the main solvent for many aroma compounds. Apart from this, fat, and especially milk fat, imparts a
121 flavour of its own. Fat has a considerable impact on flavour release, causing a retardation of the
122 release of flavour compounds from the food matrix; in low fat products flavour release tends to be
123 faster. Using sensory time-intensity methods, (Frøst, Heymann, Bredie, Dijksterhuis, & Martens,
124 2005) showed that for flavoured ice creams individual added flavour compounds were not affected
125 similarly by changes in fat level.

126 Texturally, fat plays a role depending on whether it acts as an active filler or not. Milk fat
127 globules act as structure breakers in gelled dairy products. Heat treatment of a homogenised milk
128 base leads to incorporation of the fat phase into the protein matrix. In low-fat products this can be

129 emulated by fat mimetics such as microparticulated whey proteins. However, Janhøj and Ipsen
130 (2006) showed that these microparticles do not interact with the protein network, i.e., they do not
131 act as active fillers. The functionality of microparticulated whey proteins is hence different from
132 that of the milk fat globules they replace. Even so, microparticles still provide a very high
133 creaminess in low fat plain yoghurts (Janhøj et al. 2006b). In 0.3% fat level addition of a partially
134 microparticulated whey protein blend to a total protein level of 5.4% provided a higher creaminess
135 than 3.5% fat yoghurt. Thus, the precise physical background for creaminess is still left somewhat
136 unexplained. In a different interpretation of the functionality of fat it is suggested that the fat
137 globules rotate relative to each other under shearing conditions, providing a fluidity of the mass of
138 particles with a lubricating, ‘ball-bearing’ effect (Tolstoguzov, 2003).

139 At Wageningen Center for Food Science in Netherlands, de Wijk and co-workers have
140 worked on the subject of creaminess since 1999, mainly using the Dutch vanilla custard product
141 “vla” as a model (de Wijk, Terpstra, Janssen, & Prinz, 2006). Vla is a semi-solid product,
142 essentially consisting of milk gelled with starch. In their experiments creaminess was evaluated
143 according to a consensual definition: “the range of sensations typically associated with fat content,
144 such as full and sweet taste, compact, smooth, not rough, not dry, with a velvety (not oily) coating.
145 Food disintegrates at a moderate rate”. Fat levels were varied between 0-15%. Added SiO₂
146 particles (indeed, not a common food ingredient) in the size range 2-80 µm were found to be
147 detrimental to creaminess (Engelen et al., 2005). Softer polystyrene particles had to be larger to give
148 the same response (Engelen, van der Bilt, Schipper, & Bosman, 2005), which could explain why
149 commercial microparticulated whey protein at least are not detrimental to “Creaminess”, despite
150 having particle sizes in the range ~0.1-3.0 µm. Another finding was that product and oral
151 temperature did not affect “Creaminess” ratings, even though the sensory viscosity decreased. The
152 decrease in viscosity was hypothesized to be compensated by other descriptors (Engelen et al.,

2003). Alpha-amylase and acarbose (an α -amylase inhibitor) were found, respectively, to decrease and increase creamy mouth feel (de Wijk, Prinz, Engelen, & Weenen, 2004). “Creaminess” was found to decrease somewhat with temperature in high-fat custards, and increase a little in low-fat custards. By using nose clips and flavours, the effect of olfactory cues and intranasal sensations on creamy mouth feel was confirmed (Weenen, Jellema, & de Wijk, 2005).

Based on these findings on their findings a qualitative model for “Creaminess” perception was proposed (de Wijk et al., 2006). The model partitions the contributions to creaminess in two: bulk properties (rheological properties of the bolus) and surface properties. They suggest that during the breakdown of a food, internal fat globules surfaces and there enhance lubrication and release of fat-soluble flavours. The surfacing of fat is particularly important for low fat starch-based semi-solid foods. The lower creaminess in low-fat custards was thus ascribed to a lack of lubrication, due to the lower fat content (de Wijk & Prinz, 2005; de Wijk, van Gemert, Terpstra, & Wilkinson, 2003a). Based on PLS models of “Creaminess” as a function of other sensory descriptors, the model was tentatively found to be generalisable to other semi-solids such as mayonnaises, sauces and yoghurts, even if some of the descriptors varied. One could argue that the proposed model disregards the microstructure of the products altogether; in particular the way that fat interacts with other components. In addition, it seems to fail to account for the functionality of fat mimetics such as microparticulated whey protein, unless the lubrication properties of these would be found to match those of fat, as has been suggested by others (Tolstoguzov, 2003). Evanescent wave spectroscopy has been suggested as a method to study deposition/lubrication phenomena of relevance to “Creaminess” (Malone, Appelqvist, & Norton, 2003).

174

2.1. *Relationships with physical and chemical properties - instrumental prediction of creaminess*

176

177 Precise prediction of “Creaminess” from instrumental tests is a prerequisite for
178 understanding the underlying physical and chemical properties that give creamy products. The
179 difficulty of describing “Creaminess” in purely rheological terms has long been acknowledged
180 (Wood, 1974). A certain level of viscosity combined with a smooth mouth feel is considered a sine
181 qua non condition for obtaining a creamy texture. Several other properties have been claimed to
182 influence “Creaminess”. In concentrated oil/water (o/w) emulsions such as creams, it has been
183 suggested that a high density of evenly sized fat globules contribute to “Smoothness” perception,
184 somewhat along the line of the previously mentioned ‘ball-bearing’ hypothesis. Daget and co-
185 workers (Daget, Joerg, & Bourne, 1988; Daget & Joerg, 1991)² linked creaminess in model dessert
186 creams and model soups to rheological parameters. They could predict creaminess fairly well from
187 viscosity and flow behaviour index with a quadratic relationship to perceived creaminess.
188 However, in dessert creams (Daget et al., 1988) they found that for different fat levels, maximum
189 creaminess was achieved at different viscosity levels. For model soups (Daget & Joerg, 1991) they
190 found that perceived creaminess changed according to the type of thickener they used. Both results
191 indicate that the perceived creaminess depends on other factors than what is captured by rheological
192 properties,

193 There has been much debate about which shear rate is prevalent in the mouth, not least
194 because of the practical relevance (predictive purposes) of the issue. One of the most important
195 results in this area has been the so-called ideal curve (Shama & Sherman, 1973). According to this,
196 the characteristic shear rate of a given food depends on its flow characteristics. Around the curve is
197 a zone where shear stress has the best correlation with sensory properties. For yoghurt, the relevant
198 shear rate should be around 50 s^{-1} . This is merely an abstraction, as it is inconceivable that shear
199 stress at about the same level should predominate throughout the oral cavity. The flow pattern

² Interestingly there is no mentioning in either of the two papers about neither the sensory methods they used, nor the subjects that evaluated the samples.

200 during in the mouth has recently been modelled numerically (Mathmann et al., 2006), but so far
201 only for Newtonian materials.

202 Kokini (1987), in his review of the physical basis for liquid food texture, suggested the
203 following relationships: thickness – or perceived viscosity – is a function shear stress on the palate.
204 Likewise the evaluation of smoothness involves frictional forces, so that smoothness is the
205 reciprocal of the friction force. Perception of creaminess is a function of thickness and smoothness
206 (for his precise formula, see below) both of which can be predicted from rheological properties.

207 In several of the studies on ‘vla’ an instrumental prediction of creaminess has been
208 attempted. de Wijk, van Gemert, Terpstra, & Wilkinson (2003b) found that even though they could
209 accurately predict thickness from Brookfield ($r=0.96$) and Posthumus funnel ($r=0.89$), the
210 relationship with Creamy/soft was much weaker. In predicting “Creaminess”, rheological data alone
211 (dynamic oscillation, shear viscometry, critical stress) could only account for at limited amount of
212 information, with leave-one-out cross-validation correlation coefficient $Q^2_{CV}=0.48$ (Jellema,
213 Janssen, Terpstra, de Wijk, & Smilde, 2005); this was deemed reasonably good for high-throughput
214 screening purposes. The idea would be to measure the rheological properties for a large number of
215 samples, and predict “Creaminess” from these. Indeed, it would be interesting to see what the
216 products would look like end after completing several cycles of “Creaminess” optimization using
217 this methodology. Using more ingenious sensory methods (de Wijk, Prinz, & Janssen, 2006),
218 including friction as well as IR reflectance, turbidity and image edge detection on spat out bolus,
219 much better predictions could be achieved ($r=0.96$ between actual and predicted “Creaminess”), but
220 these methods are hardly useful for high-throughput screening.

221 Our experiments have shown also shown that creaminess can not always be predicted
222 satisfactorily from rheological data alone. In plain stirred yoghurts (Janhøj, Petersen, Ipsen, & Frøst,
223 2006c), we found that a large set of rheological data comprising shear viscometry, imperfect

squeezing flow viscometry, Posthumus funnel and dynamic oscillation could only predict creaminess moderately ($R^2=0.38$). Other more straightforward sensory properties like oral viscosity could be predicted much better; remarkably, the best prediction of the latter was obtained by recording the weight of material exiting a so-called Posthumus funnel, and using this as the independent variable in PLS regression modelling.

By contrast, global image features extracted from confocal micrographs of the same yoghurt samples could predict as much as $R^2=0.60$ of creaminess (Johansen, Janhøj, Laugesen, Ipsen, & Frøst, 2006). This implies that the microstructure contains more information about creaminess than what is given through rheology. In other studies on cream cheese (Janhøj et al., 2006a) and acidified milk drinks (Janhøj, 2006; Janhøj, Frøst, & Ipsen, 2006b), we obtained much better predictions of creaminess from rheological data ($R^2=0.82$ and 0.71), but this was due to covariance with other underlying variables (sensory graininess and viscosity, respectively).

To study the relationships between sensory panel data and instrumental data, in one study we applied a regrettably under-utilized approach: combination of mixed-model ANOVA and measurement error methodology (Brockhoff, 2001). Where the traditional correlation coefficient assumes no measurement error, this approach allows separation between true correlations (related to an underlying structure) from the error. It makes it possible to find maximum correlations and confidence interval for correlations, and answer the question: “Considering the noise in the data, are the correlations as high as they can be?”. Following this method, we found that squeeze flow and contraction flow perform similarly in predicting both creaminess as well as other key texture attributes.

Overall the results suggest that creaminess can be predicted with only moderate success by rheology, but the results from more cumbersome studies reflecting the dynamic processes during food breakdown and focusing on the human-food interaction show much more promise in

prediction of creaminess. In a liquid (e.g., acidified milk drink: Janhøj, 2006; Janhøj et al., 2006b) and relatively solid dairy product categories (e.g., cream cheese; Janhøj et al., 2006a) the relationship between rheological properties and creaminess is more straightforward, and can thus be predicted quite precisely. In contrast to this, weak gels (e.g., plain yoghurt; Janhøj et al., 2006c) cannot be predicted well from rheological properties. Although some studies have shown that creaminess can be affected by changes in the aroma compounds (see below), we found no studies in the literature that have linked, e.g., gas chromatography with sensory analysis of products experimentally designed to vary in creaminess.

256

257 **3. Perception of creaminess**

258

Research on sensory perception of fat in several dairy products suggests it is closely connected to creaminess (Frøst, Dijksterhuis, & Martens, 2001; Frøst, 2002; Mela, 1988; Mela, Langley, & Martin, 1994; Mela & Marshall, 1992). In liquid dairy products, fat takes the form of emulsified globules that are perceived as smooth and creamy (Mela, 1988). Some of our previous research (Frøst et al., 2001; Frøst, 2002) suggests that the sensory perception of fat and thus also creaminess involves several senses, at least including: vision, olfaction, gustation, and haptics (tactile sensation, i.e., texture and mouth feel). Accumulated evidence also suggests that “fat” may be considered a basic taste. However, this awaits further verification of the transduction mechanisms and characterisation of the effective stimuli. We suggest that creaminess is a meta-descriptor, i.e., it is a compound property that is a result of a number of other properties. Creaminess is a multi-sensory experience and understanding the interaction between the different senses in perception in different food matrices will be beneficial for the development of low fat dairy products with appealing creaminess.

272 Foods are not in equilibrium when eaten, and understanding of the dynamics of the
273 perceptual processes as well as the food breakdown during consumption is central to disentangle the
274 gamut of factors involved (Wilkinson, Dijksterhuis, & Minekus, 2000). Texture and mouth feel
275 (oral haptics) are both active senses - it is only during motion that we can fully perceive them (de
276 Wijk, Engelen, & Prinz, 2003; Lucas, Prinz, Agrawal, & Bruce, 2002). We need to understand the
277 food breakdown during consumption, as texture properties are important for “Creaminess”.
278 (Hutchings & Lillford, 1988) suggested an approach that emphasises that texture perception is a
279 dynamic sensory monitoring of changes of the food by the processes taking place in the mouth.
280 They suggest a general three dimensional model applicable to all foods with “Degree of Structure”,
281 “Degree of lubrication”, and “Time” as its axes. As each food is changed in the mouth, it describes
282 its own “Breakdown Path”, throughout the three dimensions. This approach should be seen as a
283 start point of a general hypothesis for the physics and psychophysics of mastication.

284 Szczesniak in an overview paper discussing texture research (Szczesniak, 2002), states that
285 texture is a sensory property. As such it is only a human being that can perceive and describe it.
286 Instrumental measurements can only detect and quantify certain physical parameters which then
287 need to be interpreted in terms of sensory perception (Szczesniak, 2002). For liquids and semi-
288 solids she classifies creaminess as a “feel on soft tissue surface” property together with smoothness
289 and pulpy. In concentrated o/w emulsions such as creams, it has been suggested that a high density
290 of evenly sized fat globules contribute to “Smoothness” perception, somewhat along the line of the
291 previously mentioned ‘ball-bearing’ hypothesis. Richardson, Booth, and Stanley (1993) have
292 theorised that small evenly sized fat particles (obtained by e.g., homogenisation) make an essential
293 contribution to perception of cream-like texture. However, their results showed that homogenisation
294 of milk only had an effect on perceived creaminess when the milk was also thickened to the
295 viscosity of double cream (47.5% fat). The effects of fat globule size and distribution on creaminess

296 in a milk-relevant viscosity range thus lacked examination. Frøst et al. (2001) examined it in a more
297 realistic milk products series, and found no effect of homogenisation alone on neither creaminess,
298 nor fat perception. Likewise, later studies have also not been able to demonstrate an effect of oil
299 droplet size on “Creaminess”, “Thickness” or taste (Akhtar, Stenzel, Murray, & Dickinson, 2005).
300 Emulsifier type has been shown to influence creaminess of o/w emulsions (Moore, Langley, Wilde,
301 Fillery-Travis, & Mela, 1998).

302 An early attempt at quantifying “Creaminess” is condensed in the formula (Kokini &
303 Cussler, 1983; Kokini, 1987):

304
$$\text{Creaminess} = \text{Thickness}^{0.54} \text{Smoothness}^{0.84}$$

305 Here “Creaminess” is modelled by two sensory variables, namely “Thickness” and
306 “Smoothness”. There is no direct mention of rheological methods, but it is suggested that
307 “Creaminess” can be predicted from rheological and frictional properties, since “Thickness” and
308 “Smoothness” can be predicted from these physical properties. The derivation of this expression is
309 interesting, and says a great deal about the way sensory studies were performed in the 1970s and 80s.
310 The first part of the study was to generate vocabularies of texture terms for a series of fluid and
311 semi-solid ranging from apple juice to butter, subsequently eliminate redundant terms, and finally
312 use magnitude estimation to quantify the selected variables and fit the model. Sensory terms were
313 collated by the untrained panellists individually, as they were told to list as many words as possible
314 that described the texture of the samples. Subsequently the 15 most mentioned words were applied
315 as descriptors in magnitude estimation. In magnitude estimation the panellists are told to score the
316 intensities of a given attribute relative to that of a standard, i.e., a ratio scale is used. Averaged
317 attribute scores were then regressed one by one on the remaining descriptors using multiple linear
318 regressions, yielding a correlation matrix, from which redundant terms were identified.

319

320 As has been pointed out, this approach would not have been used today (Elmore et al.,
321 1999), where descriptive analysis (and the corresponding multivariate data analysis) is considered
322 state of the art (Lawless & Heymann, 1998). And, by excluding some descriptors that are clearly
323 perceivable, we risk bias by the dumping effect. The dumping effect may occur when subjects are
324 not allowed to rate all present sensations. Then the panellists may “dump” a sensation (e.g., vanilla)
325 to an inappropriate scale (e.g., sweetness) and thereby erroneously change the rating of this
326 property. Our approach has been to collect full descriptive analysis of the samples in each
327 experimental set. Table 1 lists all sensory descriptors used in our four experiments. Table 2 lists the
328 main differences between our sensory methods, and those of Kokini and co-workers (Kokini &
329 Cussler, 1983; Kokini, Poole, Mason, Miller, & Stier, 1984; Kokini, 1987).

330 With our most coveted descriptor “Creaminess” we used a very different approach than with
331 the rest. The very use of the descriptor was imposed by the panel leader. No consensus on the use of
332 the term “Creaminess” was sought between the panellists, similar to the procedure of Kilcast and
333 Clegg (2002). Indeed, the panellists were instructed to use their own idiosyncratic concept of
334 “Creaminess”. No reference material was provided. All three items violate the principles of
335 descriptive analysis to varying degrees. Moreover, the very concept of asking a panellist to assign a
336 score of a complex descriptor such as “Creaminess” is actually a violation of the simple
337 psychophysical model underlying all sensory science (Lawless & Heymann, 1998). We chose this
338 approach to study the perception of “Creaminess”. Had we carefully defined the descriptor to the
339 panellists, they would have merely returned this definition to us, and we would have learned
340 nothing new from it. Allowing idiosyncratic definition of creaminess gave us the opportunity to
341 explore differences in creaminess ratings among the panellists.

342

343 3.1. *Correlations with other sensory properties*

344
345 As previously mentioned, Kokini and co-workers suggested that “Creaminess” is related to
346 smoothness and viscosity (Kokini, Kadane, & Cussler, 1977; Kokini & Cussler, 1983; Kokini et al.,
347 1984; Kokini, 1987). However, in their studies, panellists were instructed to only describe the
348 texture of the samples, so contributions from other sensory modalities were obviously not
349 discovered. Other studies, using descriptive sensory analysis have shown contributions from
350 aroma/flavour and taste sensations. In vanilla pudding (Elmore et al., 1999), showed that besides
351 from texture properties dairy and sweet flavour also contributed to consumers’ liking of creaminess.
352 Kora, Latrille, Souchon, and Martin (2003) showed that addition of flavouring agent decreased
353 thickness, also indicating some texture-flavour interactions in low fat flavoured yoghurts.

354 Over the course of the project we have performed four different descriptive analyses,
355 encompassing both liquid (acidified milk drinks), weak gels (plain yoghurts, vanilla yoghurts), and
356 semi-solid to solid (cream cheese) dairy products. Table 3 lists correlation coefficient between each
357 individual descriptor and creaminess for all experiments. From this it is clear that other sensory
358 properties more than only texture properties relate to creaminess. Some visual properties are closely
359 linked to the structure of the sample and thus co-vary with some texture properties (e.g., glossy,
360 grainy, visual viscosity). We have used structure-related correlations to predict creaminess fairly
361 well from surface images of yoghurts and cream cheese (Johansen, Laugesen, Janhøj, Ipsen, &
362 Frøst, 2006). Among the texture properties it is apparent that smoothness is central for creaminess,
363 with a positive correlation in all four dairy product categories. But also viscosity and fatty after
364 mouth feel are important properties. In contrast, other structure properties like presence of grains,
365 chalkiness, stickiness and a dry after mouth feel is detrimental to creaminess. Astringency elicits an
366 interesting behaviour: in a liquid system (acidified milk drinks) it is positively correlated to
367 creaminess, but in the other systems it is negatively correlated. In the specific acidified milk drinks

368 astringency is related to a high milk solid non-fat level. These samples were also the ones with a
369 higher viscosity, cream flavour and fatty after mouth feel. So the negative effect of astringency on
370 creaminess may be overruled by the other properties. Other sensory properties like aroma, flavour,
371 and taste are not linked to structure in the same rigid fashion. In all four cases a positive correlation
372 between cream flavour and creaminess is found. So deliberately manipulating the level of cream
373 flavour, can affect the perceived creaminess. This has previously been shown in milk (Frøst et al.,
374 2001), but failed to have an effect in cream cheese (Frøst, 2002). By attending to details in the
375 individual product categories differences will be revealed.

376 Our study of acidified milk drinks (Janhøj et al., 2006b), showed that although smoothness
377 and creaminess is correlated, the relationship is not straightforward. The interrelationships among
378 different descriptors showed that our highly interesting descriptor “Creaminess” is well correlated
379 to a number of descriptors encompassing both, appearance, aroma, taste, flavour and texture (refer
380 to Table 3). In contrast, smoothness is only moderately positively correlated to “Creaminess”
381 (correlation coefficient = 0.238, Table 3). However, as Fig. 1 shows, it is evident that the difference
382 in milk solids non-fat yields two markedly different types of relationships. We suggest two
383 plausible reasons for these differences: 1) it stems from a higher intensity in dairy flavours with a
384 positive contribution to “Creaminess”, here: “Buttermilk” and “Cream flavour”, combined with a
385 lower intensity in dairy flavours that decrease Creaminess, here: “Boiled milk flavour” for the high
386 milk solids nonfat samples. 2) At a higher level of “Viscosity”, its contribution to “Creaminess”
387 overrules that of “Smoothness”, so even samples with low “Smoothness” can still possess a very
388 high “Creaminess”.

389 We studied vanilla yoghurts (Frøst, 2006), systematically varying both texture (different
390 levels of total protein adjusted with a microparticulated whey protein blend), taste (sugar level) and
391 vanilla intensity (flavour levels). Here we also found that viscosity and smoothness are positively

392 correlated to “Creaminess” (refer to Table 3), but that sweetness and flavour notes like cream,
393 vanilla, coconut and caramel also contribute in a positive manner. Similarly, in plain yoghurts
394 (Janhøj et al., 2006c) it appears that although the major contribution to “Creaminess” in yoghurts is
395 related to texture and mouth-feel descriptors, a number of flavour descriptors are also involved
396 (refer to Table 3). Based on the broad range of sensory properties of the samples, we feel confident
397 in making a general conclusion about “Creaminess” in stirred plain yoghurts. A stirred plain
398 yoghurt with high “Creaminess” is characterized by a relatively high, but not too high, viscosity. It
399 must possess a smooth mouth feel, and fatty after mouth feel. The yoghurts with high “Creaminess”
400 ratings are also high in intensity of fat-related flavors, like cream, and butter, and they are sweeter
401 than those with less “Creaminess”. Lastly, in cream cheese (Janhøj et al., 2006a) we found that
402 several key sensory attributes are strongly correlated. The positive correlation between
403 “Creaminess” and key textural attributes such as smoothness and meltdown rate is high. But also
404 glossy and some flavour notes like cream and butter show clear positive correlations with
405 creaminess (refer to Table 3).

406

407 3.2. *Individual differences in rating of creaminess*

408

409 Individual differences in many types of perception are a fact. Some can be linked to
410 exposure and culture, others to genetic factors. A few studies have investigated how background or
411 genetics affect creaminess perception. PROP-taster status has been suggested as a reason for
412 individual differences. PROP (6-*n*-propylthiouracil) is a bitter tasting compound, the perception of
413 which is genetically determined. Individuals can be grouped as non-tasters, medium tasters and
414 super-tasters based upon their sensitivity to PROP (Bartoshuk, Duffy, & Miller, 1994). Tasters
415 (medium and super-tasters) are more sensitive to a number of stimuli – among them fat (Bartoshuk,

2000). Super-tasters have more taste buds in their mouth. They are innervated by trigeminal and other nerve fibers, which may produce a greater somatosensory sensation on the tongue. PROP-taster status and creaminess perception have been investigated in semi-trained subjects (Kirkmeyer & Tepper, 2003b) and has later been extended to consumers (Kirkmeyer & Tepper, 2005). They found that super-tasters overall used a more complex vocabulary to describe creaminess in dairy products and they relied more heavily on dairy flavour and texture attributes in their evaluation. So even though the overall impression of creaminess was similar for non-tasters and super-tasters, the sensory cues the two groups used to evaluate creaminess were different.

Since we allowed trained sensory panellists to use their idiosyncratic definitions of creaminess, we could investigate differences among them in creaminess-ratings. Significant individual differences were observed among the panellists in the plain yoghurt experiment (Frøst, Janhøj, & Martens, 2004; Frøst & Janhøj, 2006). A subsequent detailed analysis of all four experiments showed that some panellists emphasise flavour contributions more than others, in accordance with the findings of Kirkmeyer & Tepper (2003a). In our vanilla yoghurt study (Frøst, 2006), we observed a puzzling difference between the sensory panel and untrained subjects. The trained panel showed a slight positive effect of vanilla flavour concentration on creaminess, while the untrained subjects showed a decrease in creaminess ratings at the high vanilla flavour concentration. The reason for this difference can be that the ordinary consumer perceives food in a synthetic manner – i.e., perceiving the totality of the food, whereas the perception of the sensory panellist in the sensory booth is extremely analytical, paying attention to all details separately. We suggest that the different modes of perception – synthetic and analytical - can affect the rating in experimental situations.

Currently only one study has examined cross-cultural differences in creaminess perception. As part of a study on differences in perception of sweetness and liking between Australians and

Japanese, Prescott et al. (1997) also evaluated creaminess in ice creams. Results showed that, in ice cream with lower sweetness, Japanese rated creaminess higher than Australians did. In a very recent experiment cross-cultural differences in perception of creaminess were investigated in Danish and Korean students, chosen to represent populations with very different food habits. We examined creaminess and hedonic perception in a set of six long-life acidified milk drinks, using 384 subjects equally divided between Seoul and Copenhagen, balanced over gender. The results showed cultural differences in creaminess ratings (Frøst, Kim, Kim, & Prescott, 2006). These differences indicate that creaminess may not be universal but to some extent it is a learned percept, reflecting the foods we have been exposed to.

3.3. *Integration of input from different sensory modalities*

It is questionable if creaminess perception depends on exactly the same factors in all types of dairy products. Comparisons of sensory perception of fat in liquids and solid dairy products show inferior estimations and discrimination of fat levels in solid foods (Drewnowski, Shrager, Lipsky, Stellar, & Greenwood, 1989). Similarly, ratings of creaminess in the same foods provided better discrimination in liquids than in solids. It indicates markedly different sensory pathways for fat and creaminess in different food matrices. The physical state of the food system (liquid, weak gel, semi-solid to solid foods) affects the importance of different senses in perception of creaminess, as outlined above.

Approaches to study sensory interactions can be to exclude of one or more of the senses, then observe the effect on the perception – in this case perceived creaminess. Most often vision and olfaction is excluded. Visual stimulation can easily be blocked by preventing visual access to the food, e.g., by serving it in closed containers with a straw, serving it under lowlight conditions, or

more cumbersome - blindfolding subjects. Olfaction can be excluded by blocking the nose either with a nose clip, or simply asking subjects to pinch the nose during the experiment. In some studies taste has been excluded by anaesthesia (Todrank & Bartoshuk, 1991; Lehman, Bartoshuk, Catalanotto, Kveton, & Lowlicht, 1995). However, for perception under normal food and beverage consumption circumstances the most relevant senses to exclude are vision (similar to drinking from a closed container), and to some degree olfaction (having a cold, and the orthonasal lack of aroma/smell when drinking through a straw). By adding a flavour substance and using nose clips, the effect of olfactory cues and the intranasal sensation on creamy mouth feel was confirmed in vla (Weenen et al., 2005). With similar approaches Kora et al. (2003) and Saint-Eve, Paci Kora, and Martin (2004) have studied texture-flavour interactions in yoghurts, and found effects on texture perception (smoothness and thickness) of the complexity of the flavouring agent. In contrast to this, we found that even though input from different senses is integrated in the creaminess percept, it is remarkably robust to the absence of the visual and olfactory input. Our results, with 40 untrained subjects, show that the creaminess ratings for nine sensory different vanilla-flavoured yoghurts remain unchanged when both visual and olfactory inputs are excluded. This indicates that mouth feel and taste provides sufficient sensory input that allows the absent input to be reliably predicted and thus give the full percept of creaminess.

481

3.4. *Neural correlates of multisensory stimuli*

483

The cortical representation of food texture, gustatory and olfactory perception shows some degree of convergence in specific areas in the orbitofrontal cortex, where single-neuron recording on primates has shown that some neurons respond to specific patterns of combinations of sensory inputs (Rolls, 2004). Responses to sensory properties of fat show that some converge from taste, and others to odour representations (Rolls, Critchley, Browning, Hernadi, & Lenard, 1999).

489 Interestingly, some populations of neurons in the orbitofrontal cortex in macaque monkeys have
490 been found to respond to viscosity stimuli (carboxymethyl cellulose solutions of different
491 viscosities), while others respond specifically to gritty texture (in the form of suspended
492 microspheres). Some neurons respond unimodally to texture, while others also receive taste input
493 (Rolls, Verhagen, & Kadohisa, 2003). The results provide some initial evidence about the
494 information channels that is used to represent the texture and flavour of food. The orbitofrontal
495 cortex is also an important region of the brain with respect to representation of the reward value of
496 sensory inputs (Kringelbach, O'Doherty, Rolls, & Andrews, 2003; Kringelbach, 2004; Rolls, 2004).
497 This indicates that the cortical representation of complex sensory inputs with high reward value,
498 e.g., a food product with high creaminess, may converge in this region. The neurocognitive
499 correlates of sensory integration of multimodal stimuli like foods are still largely unmapped
500 (Verhagen & Engelen, 2006). Many interactions between sensory modalities can be observed, but
501 the neural bases for the multisensory integration are currently not understood well. Just recently
502 there is an emergence of neuroscientific models providing a framework for further exploration of
503 this field (Verhagen & Engelen, 2006). The coupling of multisensory integration with our percept of
504 reward and subjective pleasantness may provide very useful cues for to understand control of food
505 intake and appetite (Rolls, 2005).

506

507 **4. Conclusions**

508

509 Taken together the findings in all investigated types of dairy products support the contention
510 that texture properties plays an important role for the creaminess. Our findings suggest that texture
511 properties are most decisive for creaminess in liquid (milk drinks) and semi-solid (cream cheese)
512 products, but that flavour properties (aromas with positive connotations and sweetness) contribute

513 more in weak gels (stirred yoghurts). The sensory properties that correlate most with creaminess
514 irrespective of product type are: smoothness, fatty after mouth feel and cream flavour. As with
515 many other sensory perceptions, our results show that there are significant individual, as well as
516 cultural differences. The differences in creaminess ratings we observed between untrained subjects
517 and a sensory panel may be an effect of a general difference between synthetic and analytical
518 perception.

519 Our results, viewed together with results from de Wijk et al. (2006) support the notion that
520 instrumental predictions of creaminess need to take into account the dynamic (i.e., time-dependent)
521 aspect of food breakdown. On the data analytical side, we find that a model-free, soft-modelling
522 approach to psychorheology, in which raw data is linked to sensory scores using multivariate
523 techniques, in general outperforms the prevalent uni-variate methods where sensory data is
524 regressed on more or less physically meaningful parameters extracted, e.g., from flow or
525 compression curves.

526

527 **5. Future directions for creaminess research**

528

529 We suggest several lines of research for the future. Studies on the effect of our physiological
530 states – hungry or full – is an interesting path to follow. The question is: does our desire for
531 “Creaminess” depend on our need for nutrients at that time-point? And further – it is well-known
532 that during consumption of a food, the sensory specific satiety changes (Rolls, Rolls, Rowe, &
533 Sweeney, 1981). Eating a food to satisfaction decreases the perceived pleasantness of this food –
534 but knowledge about how it affects perceived “Creaminess” is lacking. Studies examining this will
535 provide some insight into whether “Creaminess” is a neutral sensory property, or a positive stimulus

536 reward – an affective learned association. It may well be that it creaminess is both a sensory
537 property, but simultaneously a hedonic experience.

538 Mastering the fundamentals of the formation and control of oral graininess in low-fat acid
539 milk gel products will enable the dairy industry to develop products with a higher acceptability for
540 the consumer. In the fresh cheese segment, in particular, there are several process parameters to
541 play manipulate (pH, salt, etc.). With regards to microparticulated protein, there will no doubt be
542 much activity in both fundamental research and more application oriented work in the time to come.
543 There is ample room for developing micro-particles with properties (particle size distribution,
544 surface reactivity) tailored to specific applications. A better mechanistic understanding of how these
545 ingredients interact with food matrices, and its relevance to the sensory perception is still much
546 needed.

547 For instrumental prediction of creaminess, we suggest development of methods that are a
548 combination of static and dynamic measurements. They should also be linked close to physical
549 properties, so that the precise mechanisms of fat and its mimetics can be elucidated. In vitro,
550 imitative methods would be of great use to the dairy industry as a means of screening product
551 formulation, but a much higher degree of sophistication than that of the old instrumental Texture
552 Profile Analysis method is necessary, both on the hardware side and the data analytical side. The
553 interactions between food and palate are crucial for new insight in this area. We suggest studies of
554 surface adhesion and the attenuation of forces on the palate by microlayer of food adhered to the
555 palate.

556

557 **Acknowledgments**

558

559 This work is supported financially by the Danish Research Council for Technology and
560 Production Sciences (M.B. Frøst) and the Danish Dairy Research Foundation - Danish Dairy Board
561 (T. Janhøj). Collaborators from Arla Foods Ingredients, Nr. Vium Denmark (yoghurts); Arla Food
562 Innovation, Brabrand Denmark (cream cheeses); Symrise, Holzminden Germany (vanilla flavour
563 for yoghurts); and CP Kelco, Lille Skensved Denmark (acidified milk drinks) are thanked for
564 producing and donating products for experiments, as well as specific products knowledge during the
565 planning and performance of the studies. The technical staff from the sensory panel, Judith
566 Henning, Rikke Jensen, Maja Nerup Jensen and Lisbeth Pii Nielsen are thanked for assistance with
567 sensory tests.

568

569 **References**

570

571 Akhtar, M., Stenzel, J., Murray, B. S., & Dickinson, E. (2005). Factors affecting the perception of
572 creaminess of oil-in-water emulsions. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 19, 521-526.

573 Bartoshuk, L. M. (2000). Comparing sensory experiences across individuals: recent psychophysical
574 advances illuminate genetic variation in taste perception. *Chemical Senses*, 25, 447-460.

575 Bartoshuk, L. M., Duffy, V. B., & Miller, I. J. (1994). PTC/PROP tasting: anatomy, psychophysics
576 and sex effects. *Physiology and Behavior* 56, 1165-1171.

577 Brockhoff, P. B. (2001). Sensory profile average data: combining mixed model ANOVA with
578 measurement error methodology. *Food Quality and Preference*, 12, 413-426.

579 Buisson, D. (1995). Developing new products for the consumer. In D. Marshall (Ed.), *Food choice*
580 *and the consumer* (pp.182-215). Glasgow, UK: Blackie Academic.

Cardello, A. V. (1994). Consumer expectations and their role in food acceptance. In H.J.H. Macfie
& D.M.H. Thomson (Eds.), *Measurement of food preferences* (pp. 223-297). London, UK:
Blackie Academic and Professional.

Daget, N. & Joerg, M. (1991). Creamy Perception 2. in Model Soups. *Journal of Texture Studies*,
22, 169-189.

Daget, N., Joerg, M., & Bourne, M. (1988). Creamy perception 1. In model dessert creams. *Journal
of Texture Studies*, 18, 367-388.

de Wijk, R. A. & Prinz, J. F. (2005). The role of friction in perceived oral texture. *Food Quality and
Preference*, 16, 121-129.

de Wijk, R. A., van Gemert, L. J., Terpstra, M. E. J., & Wilkinson, C. L. (2003a). Texture of semi-
solids; sensory and instrumental measurements on vanilla custard desserts. *Food Quality
and Preference*, 14, 305-317.

de Wijk, R. A., Engelen, L., & Prinz, J. F. (2003). The role of intra-oral manipulation in the
perception of sensory attributes. *Appetite*, 40, 1-7.

de Wijk, R. A., Prinz, J. F., & Janssen, A. M. (2006). Explaining perceived oral texture of starch-
based custard desserts from standard and novel instrumental tests. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 20,
24-34.

de Wijk, R. A., Prinz, J. F., Engelen, L., & Weenen, H. (2004). The role of alpha-amylase in the
perception of oral texture and flavour in custards. *Physiology and Behavior*, 83, 81-91.

de Wijk, R. A., Terpstra, M. E. J., Janssen, A. M., & Prinz, J. F. (2006). Perceived creaminess of
semi-solid foods. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 17, 412-422.

602 de Wijk, R. A., van Gemert, L. J., Terpstra, M. E. J., & Wilkinson, C. L. (2003b). Texture of semi-
603 solids; sensory and instrumental measurements on vanilla custard desserts. *Food Quality*
604 *and Preference*, 14, 305-317.

605 Drewnowski, A., Shrager, E. E., Lipsky, C., Stellar, E., & Greenwood, M. R. C. (1989). Sugar and
606 fat: Sensory and hedonic evaluation of liquid and solid foods. *Physiology and Behavior*, 45,
607 177-183.

608 Elmore, J. R., Heymann, H., Johnson, J., & Hewett, J. E. (1999). Preference mapping: relating
609 acceptance of 'creaminess' to a descriptive sensory map of a semi-solid. *Food Quality and*
610 *Preference*, 10, 465-475.

611 Engelen, L., de Wijk, R. A., Prinz, J. F., Janssen, A. M., Weenen, H., & Bosman, F. (2003). The
612 effect of oral and product temperature on the perception of flavor and texture attributes of
613 semi-solids. *Appetite*, 41, 273-281.

614 Engelen, L., de Wijk, R. A., van der Bilt, A., Prinz, J. F., Janssen, A. M., & Bosman, F. (2005).
615 Relating particles and texture perception. *Physiology and Behavior*, 86, 111-117.

616 Engelen, L., van der Bilt, A., Schipper, M., & Bosman, F. (2005). Oral size perception of particles:
617 effect of size, type, viscosity and method. *Journal of Texture Studies*, 36, 373-386.

618 Folkenberg, D. M. & Martens, M. (2003). Sensory properties of low fat yoghurts. Part B: Hedonic
619 evaluations of plain yoghurts by consumers correlated to fat content, sensory profile and
620 consumer attitudes. *Milchwissenschaft-Milk Science International*, 58, 154-157.

- 621 Frøst, M. B. (2002). *The influence of fat content on sensory properties and consumer perception of*
622 *dairy products*. PhD-thesis The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University, Centre for
623 Advanced Food Studies, Department of Dairy and Food Science, Aarhus, Denmark.
- 624 Frøst, M. B., Dijksterhuis, G. B., & Martens, M. (2001). Sensory perception of fat in milk. *Food*
625 *Quality and Preference*, 12, 327-336.
- 626 Frøst, M. B., Heymann, H., Bredie, W. L. P., Dijksterhuis, G. B., & Martens, M. (2005). Sensory
627 measurement of dynamic flavour intensity in ice cream with different fat levels and
628 flavourings. *Food Quality and Preference*, 16, 305-314.
- 629 Frøst, M. B. & Janhøj, T. (2006). Multi-way analysis of individual differences in perception of
630 creaminess within a sensory panel. *Food Quality and Preference*, submitted.
- 631 Frøst, M. B., Janhøj, T., & Martens, M. (2004). Multi-way analysis of individual differences in
632 perception of creaminess within a sensory panel. The Seventh Sensometrics Meeting [On-
633 line]. Available: <http://www.sensometric.org/pages/lectures.htm>
- 634 Frøst, M. B. (2006). Liking and exposure: First, second and tenth time around. *Physiology and*
635 *Behavior*, 89, 47-52.
- 636 Frøst, M. B., Kim H.S., Kim, K. O., & Prescott, J. (2006). Cross-cultural differences in creaminess
637 and hedonic perception between Korean and Danish college students. Manuscript in
638 preparation.
- 639 Hutchings, J. B. & Lillford, P. J. (1988). The perception of food texture - the philosophy of the
640 breakdown path. *Journal of Texture Studies*, 19, 103-115.

641 IDF (1997). *Sensory evaluation of dairy products by scoring - Reference Method* IDF standard 99C.
642 Brussels, Belgium: International Dairy Federation.

643 ISO (1993). *Sensory analysis - Methodology - general guidance for the selection, training and*
644 *monitoring of assessors*. International Standard 8586-1. Geneva, Switzerland: International
645 Organisation for Standardisation.

646 Janhøj, T. (2006). *Microstructure and sensory perception of low-fat, semi-solid dairy products*.
647 PhD-thesis Department of Food Science - LMC, Royal Veterinary and Agricultural
648 University, Aarhus, Denmark.

649 Janhøj, T., Frøst, M. B., Andersen, C. M., Viereck, N., Ipsen, R. H., & Edrød, S. (2006a). Sensory,
650 rheological and spectroscopic characterization of low-fat and non-fat cream cheese. In P.
651 Fischer, P. Erni, & E. J. Windhab (Eds.), *Proceedings from the 4th International Symposium*
652 *on Food Rheology and Structure, Zürich, Switzerland* (pp. 383-387).

653 Janhøj, T., Frøst, M. B., & Ipsen, R. (2006b). Sensory and rheological characterisation og acidified
654 milk drinks. *Submitted to Food Hydrocolloids*.

655 Janhøj, T. & Ipsen, R. H. (2006). Effect of pre-heat treatment on the functionality of
656 microparticulated whey protein in acid milk gels. *Milchwissenschaft*, *61*, 131-134.

657 Janhøj, T., Petersen, C. B., Ipsen, R., & Frøst, M. B. (2006c). Sensory and rheological
658 characterization of low-fat stirred yoghurt. *Journal of Texture Studies*, *37*, 276-299.

659 Jellema, R. H., Janssen, A. M., Terpstra, M. E. J., de Wijk, R. A., & Smilde, A. K. (2005). Relating
660 the sensory sensation 'creamy mouthfeel' in custards to rheological measurements. *Journal*
661 *of Chemometrics*, *19*, 191-200.

662 Johansen, S. M. B., Janhøj, T., Laugesen, J. L., Ipsen, R., & Frøst, M. B. (2006). Prediction of
663 sensory properties of semi-solid dairy products from confocal laser scanning micrographs
664 using global feature extraction and multivariate regression techniques. *Manuscript in*
665 *preparation.*

666 Johansen, S. M. B., Laugesen, J. L., Janhøj, T., Ipsen, R. H., & Frøst, M. B. Prediction of sensory
667 properties of low-fat yoghurt and cream cheese from surface images. *Submitted to Food*
668 *Quality and Preference.*

669 Kilcast, D. & Clegg, S. (2002). Sensory perception of creaminess and its relationship with food
670 structure. *Food Quality and Preference*, 13, 609-623.

671 Kirkmeyer, S. V. & Tepper, B. J. (2003a). Understanding creaminess perception of dairy products
672 using free-choice profiling and genetic responsivity to 6-n-propylthiouracil. *Chemical*
673 *Senses*, 28, 527-536.

674 Kirkmeyer, S. V. & Tepper, B. J. (2003b). Understanding creaminess perception of dairy products
675 using free-choice profiling and genetic responsivity to 6-n-propylthiouracil. *Chemical*
676 *Senses*, 28, 527-536.

677 Kirkmeyer, S. V. & Tepper, B. J. (2005). Consumer reactions to creaminess and genetic sensitivity
678 to 6-n-propylthiouracil: A multidimensional study. *Food Quality and Preference*, 16, 545-
679 556.

680 Kokini, J. L. & Cussler, E. L. (1983). Predicting the Texture of Liquid and Melting Semi-Solid
681 Foods. *Journal of Food Science*, 48, 1221-1225.

682 Kokini, J. L., Kadane, J. B., & Cussler, E. L. (1977). Liquid texture perceived in mouth. *Journal of*
683 *Texture Studies*, 8, 195-218.

684 Kokini, J. L., Poole, M., Mason, P., Miller, S., & Stier, E. F. (1984). Identification of key textural
685 attributes of fluid and semi-solid foods using regression-analysis. *Journal of Food Science*,
686 49, 47-51.

687 Kokini, J. L. (1987). The physical basis of liquid food texture and texture-taste interactions. *Journal*
688 *of Food Engineering*, 6, 51-81.

689 Kora, E. P., Latrille, E., Souchon, I., & Martin, N. (2003). Texture-flavor interactions in low fat
690 stirred yogurt: How mechanical treatment, thickener concentration and aroma concentration
691 affect perceived texture and flavor. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, 18, 367-390.

692 Kringelbach, M. L. (2004). Food for thought: Hedonic experience beyond homeostasis in the
693 human brain. *Neuroscience*, 126, 807-819.

694 Kringelbach, M. L., O'Doherty, J., Rolls, E. T., & Andrews, C. (2003). Activation of the human
695 orbitofrontal cortex to a liquid food stimulus is correlated with its subjective pleasantness.
696 *Cerebral Cortex*, 13, 1064-1071.

697 Lawless, H. T. & Heymann, H. (1998). *Sensory Evaluation of Foods: Principles and Practices*.
698 New York, USA: Chapman and Hall.

699 Lehman, C. D., Bartoshuk, L. M., Catalanotto, F. C., Kveton, J. F., & Lowlicht, R. A. (1995). Effect
700 of anesthesia of the chorda tympani nerve on taste perception in humans. *Physiology and*
701 *Behavior*, 57, 943-951.

702 Lucas, P. W., Prinz, J. F., Agrawal, K. R., & Bruce, I. C. (2002). Food physics and oral physiology.
 703 *Food Quality and Preference*, 13, 203-213.

704 Malone, M. E., Appelqvist, I. A. M., & Norton, I. T. (2003). Oral behaviour of food hydrocolloids
 705 and emulsions. Part 1. Lubrication and deposition considerations. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 17,
 706 763-773.

707 Martens, M., Frøst, M. B., & Martens, H. (2005). Consumer attitudes to health and pleasure -
 708 survey data studied by PLSR. In T. Aluja, J. Casanovas, V. Esposito Vinzi, A. Morineau, &
 709 M. Tenenhaus (Eds.), *Proceedings of the PLS'05 International Symposium, Barcelona,*
 710 *Spain* (pp. 431-437).

711 Mathmann, K., Kowalczyk, W., Petermeier, H., Eberhard, M., Baars, A., & Delgado, A. (2006).
 712 The impact of rheological properties on mouthfeel caused by food. In P. Fischer, P. Erni, &
 713 E. J. Windhab (Eds.), *Proceedings from the 4th International Symposium on Food Rheology*
 714 *and Structure, Zürich, Switzerland* (pp. 459-463).

715 Mela, D. J. (1988). Sensory assessment of fat content in fluid dairy products. *Appetite*, 10, 37-44.

716 Mela, D. J., Langley, K. R., & Martin, A. (1994). Sensory Assessment of Fat-Content - Effect of
 717 Emulsion and Subject Characteristics. *Appetite*, 22, 67-81.

718 Mela, D. J. & Marshall, R. J. (1992). Sensory properties and perceptions of fats. In D.J. Mela (Ed.),
 719 *Dietary fats - determinants of preference, selection and consumption* (pp. 43-57). London,
 720 UK: Elsevier.

721 Moore, P. B., Langley, K., Wilde, P. J., Fillery-Travis, A., & Mela, D. J. (1998). Effect of
 722 emulsifier type on sensory properties of oil-in-water emulsions. *Journal of the Science of*
 723 *Food and Agriculture*, 76, 469-476.

724 Parr, H. J., Knox, B., & Hamilton, J. A. (2001). Problems and pitfalls in the development and
 725 marketing of reduced-fat foods. *Leatherhead Food RA Food Industry Journal*, 4, 50-60.

726 Prescott, J., Bell, G. A., Gillmore, R., Yoshida, M., O'Sullivan, M., Korac, S. et al. (1997). Cross-
 727 cultural comparisons of Japanese and Australian responses to manipulations of sweetness in
 728 foods. *Food Quality and Preference*, 8, 45-55.

729 Richardson, N. J., Booth, D. A., & Stanley, N. L. (1993). Effect of homogenization and fat content
 730 on oral perception of low and high viscosity model creams. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, 8,
 731 133-143.

732 Richardson-Harman, N. J., Stevens, R., Walker, S., Gamble, J., Miller, M., Wong, M. et al. (2000).
 733 Mapping consumer perceptions of creaminess and liking for liquid dairy products. *Food*
 734 *Quality and Preference*, 11, 239-246.

735 Rolls, B. J., Rolls, E. T., Rowe, E. A., & Sweeney, K. (1981). Sensory specific satiety in man.
 736 *Physiology and Behavior*, 27, 137-142.

737 Rolls, E. T., Critchley, H. D., Browning, A. S., Hernadi, I., & Lenard, L. (1999). Responses to the
 738 sensory properties of fat of neurons in the primate orbitofrontal cortex. *Journal of*
 739 *Neuroscience*, 19, 1532-40.

740 Rolls, E. T. (2004). Multisensory Neuronal Convergence of Taste, Somatosensory, Visual,
741 Olfactory, and Auditory inputs. In G.A.Calvert, C.Spence, & B.E.Stein (Eds.), *The*
742 *handbook of multisensory processes* (pp. 311-331). Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press.

743 Rolls, E. T. (2005). Taste, olfactory, and food texture processing in the brain, and the control of
744 food intake. *Physiology and Behavior*, 85, 45-56.

745 Rolls, E. T., Verhagen, J. V., & Kadohisa, M. (2003). Representations of the texture of food in the
746 primate orbitofrontal cortex: neurons responding to viscosity, grittiness, and capsaicin.
747 *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 90, 3711-3724.

748 Saint-Eve, A., Paci Kora, E., & Martin, N. (2004). Impact of the olfactory quality and chemical
749 complexity of the flavouring agent on the texture of low fat stirred yogurts assessed by three
750 different sensory methodologies. *Food Quality and Preference*, 15, 655-668.

751 Shama, F. & Sherman, P. (1973). Identification of stimuli controlling the sensory evaluation of
752 viscosity. II. Oral methods. *Journal of Texture Studies*, 4, 111-118.

753 Szczesniak, A. S. (2002). Texture is a sensory property. *Food Quality and Preference*, 13, 215-225.

754 Todrank, J. & Bartoshuk, L. M. (1991). A taste illusion: Taste sensation localized by touch.
755 *Physiology and Behavior*, 50, 1027-1031.

756 Tolstoguzov, V. (2003). Some thermodynamic considerations in food formulation. *Food*
757 *Hydrocolloids*, 17, 1-23.

758 Tuorila, H., Cardello, A. V., & Leshner, L. (1994). Antecedents and consequences of expectations
759 related to fat-free and regular-fat food. *Appetite*, 23, 247-264.

760 Verhagen, J. V., & Engelen, L. (2006). The neurocognitive bases of human multimodal food
 761 perception: Sensory integration. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 30, 613-650.

762 Ward, C. D. W., Koeferli, C. S., Schwegler, P. P., Schaeppi, D., & Plemmons, L. E. (1999).
 763 European strawberry yogurt market analysis with a case study on acceptance drivers for
 764 children in Spain using principal component analysis and partial least squares regression.
 765 *Food Quality and Preference*, 10, 387-400.

766 Weenen, H., Jellema, R. H., & de Wijk, R. A. (2005). Sensory sub-attributes of creamy mouthfeel
 767 in commercial mayonnaises, custard desserts and sauces. *Food Quality and Preference*, 16,
 768 163-170.

769 Wilkinson, C., Dijksterhuis, G. B., & Minekus, M. (2000). From food structure to texture. *Trends in*
 770 *Food Science & Technology*, 11, 442-450.

771 Wood, F. W. (1974). Approach to understanding creaminess. *Starke*, 26, 127-130.
 772
 773

774

775

776 Table 1: Applied sensory descriptors used in the different experiments, special evaluation procedures and reference materials. Only descriptors

777 significantly different between products are shown

778

Descriptors	Special procedures during evaluation (reference material)	Original Danish words	Product			
			Acidified milk drink	Vanilla yoghurt	Plain yoghurt	Cream Cheese
Appearance		Udseende				
Visual	Measured during swirling of glass	Viskositet	√			
Viscosity						
Transparency	Transparency of the sample at the edge of the glass tilted approximately 45°	Gennemsigtighed	√			
Glass Coating	Amount of milk drink coating glass after swirling glass thoroughly	Glasvedhæng	√			
Grainy		Grynethed		√	√	
Grain size		Størrelse af gryn				√
Glossy		Blankhed			√	√
White		Hvid farve		√	√	√
Grey		Grå farve			√	√
Green		Grøn farve			√	
Yellow		Gul farve		√	√	√
Blue		Blå farve				√
Colour		Farve	√			
Aroma (evaluated by sniffing through the nose without sample in mouth)		Lugt				
Buttermilk	(Organically produced buttermilk (ArlaFoods, Denmark))	Kærnemælkslugt	√		√	
Cream	(full fat homogenised milk (3.5% fat) and cream (38% fat) in a 1 to 5 mixture)	Flødelugt			√	√
Butter	(Lump of organically produced old fashioned churned, salted butter (Lurpak®, ArlaFoods, Denmark))	Smørlugt				√
Lamb	(see below for detailed procedure*)	Lammelugt			√	
Goat	(goat yoghurt)	Gedelugt				√
Acidic	Intensity of acidic smell when first opening the sample	Syrlig lugt				√
Flour	(0.3 L yoghurt (Jersey 0.1% fat, Thise Dairy, Denmark) added 15 mL wheat flour)	Melet lugt			√	
Raspberry	(0.5 L 0.5% fat milk added 30 ml organically produced raspberry	Hindbrælugt	√			

cordial mixer)

Flavour (evaluated with sample in mouth)

Buttermilk flavour	(see above)
Cream flavour	(see above)
Butter flavour	(Lump of organically produced old fashioned churned, salted butter (Lurpak ®, ArlaFoods, Denmark))
Lamb flavour	(see above)
Goat flavour	(see above)
Boiled milk	(0.5 L 3.5% fat milk + ½ Malaco caramel roll + 100 g parsnip boiled until caramel roll is melted and parsnip is soft. Sieved and cooled)
Flour flavour	(see above)
Raspberry	(see above)
Citrus flavour	(A small piece of lemon)
Vanilla	
Caramel	(Werther's Original hard candy)
Coconut	(coconut flavour, Weightwatchers)
Yoghurt	(3.5% fat plain yoghurt)

Taste

Sour taste
Sweet taste
Salt taste

Texture and mouthfeel

Smoothness	
Viscosity	
Firmness	
Chalkiness	
Graininess	
Stickiness	
Meltdown rate	Amount of "work" to break down the bolus
Astringent	Intensity of saliva losing lubrication in the mouth – using the tongue against the palate or the back of the incisors
Fatty after mouthfeel	Degree of "fatty" mouth coating after expectoration of the sample
Dry after mouthfeel	Degree of mouth dryness after expectoration of the sample

Smag

Smag af kærnemælk	√		√	
Smag af fløde	√	√	√	√
Smag af smør			√	√
Smag af lam			√	
Smag af ged				√

Melet smag	√		√	√
Hindbærsmag	√			
Citrussmag	√			
Vanille		√		
Karamel		√		
Kokos		√		
Yoghurt		√		

Smag

Sur smag		√	√	√
Sød smag	√	√	√	√
Salt smag				√

Tekstur

Glathed	√	√	√	√
Viskositet	√	√	√	
Fasthed				√
Kridtethed				√
Grynethed				√
Klistrethed				√
Nedsmeltning		√	√	√
Astringerende	√	√	√	√
Fedt eftermundfylde	√	√	√	
Tør eftermundfylde		√	√	√

Non-oral manipulation

Resistance	Resistance during spread with a knife
Resistance	Resistance during sucking through a straw
Non-oral viscosity	Rate of a spoonful to blur when it is placed on top of the sample
Graininess on lid	Half a spoon of sample spread on a lid
Viscosity with spoon	Viscosity measured after three stirs with spoon
Flow from spoon	

Meta-descriptor

Creaminess	Perceived creaminess of the sample evaluated in the mouth
------------	---

Manipulation med ske

Modstand				√
Modstand	√			
Gelstivhed			√	
Grynethed på låg			√	
Viskositet med ske		√	√	
Sammenhængende flydning fra ske			√	

Metadeskriptor

Cremethed	√	√	√	√
-----------	---	---	---	---

780 Table 2. Outline of differences between the sensory work of Kokini et al. (1987) and the present work.

781

782

Parameter	Kokini et al.	Our approach
Sensory methodology	Magnitude estimation	Descriptive analysis
Sensory vocabulary used	Fixed vocabulary previously generated from most used terms mentioned individually by panellists, only for texture properties	Vocabulary specific to range of product studied, generated by consensus in panel for all sensory modalities – except for creaminess, where idiosyncratic definitions was allowed
Panellists	Untrained panellists	Panellists selected and trained according to ISO standards (ISO-8586-1, 1993)
Conditions of test	Room temperature	Temperature in accordance with IDF Standard (IDF, 1997)
Data analysis	Univariate data analysis	Multivariate data analysis

783

784 Table 3. Correlation coefficients between individual sensory properties and creaminess. Based on raw data, without averaging over panellists
785

Descriptors	Correlation groups	Product			
		Acidified milk drink	Vanilla yoghurt	Plain yoghurt	Cream Cheese
Appearance					
Visual Viscosity	Positive	0.661			
Glossy				0.158	0.735
Glass Coating			0.631		
Grainy	Changing		0.109	-0.190	
White			-0.094	0.126	-0.151
Yellow			-0.013	0.091	0.266
Green	Negative			-0.101	
Blue					-0.183
Colour (white-red)		-0.255			
Transparency		-0.272			
Grain size					-0.340
Grey					-0.121
Aroma					
Cream	Positive			0.218	0.448
Butter					0.384
Buttermilk	Changing	0.409		-0.070	
Lamb	Negative			-0.137	
Goat					-0.194
Acidic					-0.065
Boiled milk		-0.073			
Flour				-0.109	
Raspberry		-0.109			
Flavour					

Cream flavour		0.460	0.282	0.477	0.568
Butter flavour				0.398	0.568
Vanilla			0.103		
Caramel	Positive		0.203		
Coconut			0.222		
Citrus flavour		0.145			
Buttermilk flavour		0.570		-0.013	
Flour flavour	Changing	0.414	-0.074	-0.261	-0.496
Lamb flavour				-0.164	
Raspberry		-0.034			
Goat flavour	Negative				-0.102
Boiled milk		-0.186			
Yoghurt			-0.224		
Taste					
Sour taste	Positive		-0.391	-0.233	-0.183
Salt taste					0.178
Sweet taste	Changing	-0.336	0.313	0.194	0.303
<i>Texture and mouthfeel</i>					
Smoothness		0.238	0.311	0.469	0.826
Viscosity	Positive	0.803	0.287	0.238	
Resistance		0.781			
Fatty after mouthfeel		0.599	0.484	0.361	
Meltdown rate	Changing		-0.059	0.140	0.684
Astringent		0.378	-0.270	-0.277	-0.475
Chalkiness					-0.582
Firmness	Negative				-0.622
Stickiness					-0.629
Graininess					-0.814
Dry after mouthfeel			-0.222	-0.309	-0.164

Non-oral manipulation


Non-oral viscosity	Positive			0.133	
Viscosity with spoon		0.159		0.157	
Flow from spoon	Negative			-0.066	
Graininess on lid				-0.176	
Resistance to spread					-0.662
Details about data		510 samples: 17 products 10 sensory panellists 3 sensory replicates	270 samples: 9 products 10 sensory panellists 3 sensory replicates	980 samples: 28 products 12 sensory panellists 3 true replicates	600 samples: 20 products 10 sensory panellists 3 sensory replicates

786

787 **Figure legends**

788
789 Fig. 1. Relationships between “Smoothness” and “Creaminess”, specified for high (8.5%)
790 and low (2.0%) milk solids non-fat (MNSF) level groups of samples. Sample abbreviations
791 refer to MSNF-level (8=8.5%, 2=2%); acidification method (lac, lactic acid bacteria – a
792 drinking yoghurt, cit, citric acid – a milk-juice drink. Last 2-4 characters refer to added CMC
793 and pectin at different levels. For all details refer to (Janhøj et al., 2006b).

794
795
796
797



798